MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
January 17, 1968
INDEX

ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting 1

2. Approval of Minutes of November 1967 Meeting 1

LEGISLATION 1-2

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. Department of the Navy

Defense Office Building, Bolling/Anacostia 2-3

2. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Washington Subway System 3

3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Arlington National Cemetery 3-4

4. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Gallaudet College Dormitory Building 4

b. Approval of Artist for Chandler, Oklahoma Post Office 4-5

5. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Proposed Construction Program, FY 1969 5

6. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses & Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act
Appendix 1 5

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) O.G. 68-113, 2901 M Street, N.W. 5

(2) Appendix 2 5

7. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

Washington Channel Waterfront 5-6

INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

   Washington Channel Waterfront 6

2. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

   a. Stations at Connecticut Avenue and K Sts., N.W. and Union Station 6

   b. Graphics 7

3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

   Arlington National Cemetery 7

4. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

   Gallaudet College Dormitory Building 8

5. Department of the Navy

   Defense Office Building/ Bolling/Anacostia 9

6. Other Projects

   a. Design of Medals 9

   b. Lighting on Bridges 9

7. Freer Gallery of Art

   Inspection of Proposed Acquisitions 9

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on 17 January 1968. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:15 a.m. with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki
Chloethiel Woodard Smith
John Walker

Staff: Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald B. Myer, Asst. Secy
Nancee Black, Research Analyst
Myra Younker, Editor

NCPC: Steven Kloss
David MacKinnon

Recorder: Steven Miller

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting

Tuesday, 20 February 1968, was approved. Tuesday - Wednesday, 19-20 March 1968 were tentatively selected for the following month.

2. Approval of Minutes of November 1967 Meeting.

Unanimously approved.

III. LEGISLATION

The Secretary presented the following proposed legislation.

1. Draft Legislation - Bureau of the Budget - 90th C

Authorizing the Trustees of the National Gallery of Art to construct a building or buildings on the site bounded by Fourth Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, Third Street, and Madison Drive, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, and making provision for the maintenance thereof.

The Commission's approval was reported to the Bureau of the Budget.
EXHIBIT A

2. H.R. 13778-11/9/67-Mr. Harsha-90thC

To amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to preserve the integrity of the original agreements and amendments in the area.

Also discussed were S. 2518-10/10/67-Mr. Clark-90thC and H.R. 13412-10/10/67-Mr.Wright-90thC, bills "To amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to prohibit the erection of any building within one thousand feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in the District of Columbia without the approval of the Center's trustees, and for other purposes."

EXHIBITS B,C,D

The above legislation pertained to the dispute between the Kennedy Center trustees and the Watergate Developers regarding the construction of Building #1, Stage 5, of the Watergate project.

The members decided that a detailed opinion was not in order since these bills were merely legal maneuvers pertaining to the dispute and did not involve the Commission.

The Commission's decision was reported to appropriate Committees of the 90th Congress.

3. H.J.Res. 914-10/30/67-Mr. Scheuer-90thC

To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas.

The Commission's approval was reported to the Committee on Public Works. EXHIBIT E

IV. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

The Secretary presented and reviewed the following projects.

1. Department of the Navy

Defense Office Building, Bolling/Anacostia - Revised Design by Minoru Yamasaki, architect.

The site plan model showed the bus entrance plan changed to reflect the main entrance as recommended by the Commission.

Models of the original scheme and two new studies of the sunshade were submitted. One study changed the spacing and dimensions of the metal hangars, while the other used precast concrete hangars. In both schemes the hangars were still decorative features and not a part of the structural system.

The members felt that the sunshade hangars should be either removed entirely or restudied in relation to the structural system.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect later.

2. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Washington Subway System

a. Stations at Connecticut Avenue and K Street, N.W., and Union Station designed by Harry Weese and Associates, architects.

Eight schematic drawings and four perspective renderings were submitted with a one-half inch scale model representing a prototype of a station. The plan for both stations was based on the general design principles for side platforms which was previously approved by the Commission.

The members commented briefly on the excellent design. Their approval was reported to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. EXHIBIT F

b. Graphics designed by Massimo Vignelli. Materials submitted included 6 bronze pylons denoting station identification at the surface and within the station. Panels showing details of lettering, map information, relative scale of the pylons, etc., were also furnished.

The Secretary explained that, according to the designer, the vertical placement of letters was primarily for "shock value" and would cause the passenger to remember the location in relation to his travel.

The members also discussed the closeness of the letters which would be viewed sideways and difficult to read in motion. The possibility of having the station identification "flashed-on" within the cars was mentioned.

A more detailed discussion was held later with the designer.

3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Arlington National Cemetery, Revised designs of Administration Building and Chapel by Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, architects. Models, perspectives and elevations were submitted for both projects.

Revisions to the Administration Building included enlarging the central court and eliminating the skylight. The structural system was clearly expressed by substituting conventional columns in a regular module for the more massive piers of the previous design. The simplicity of the revised design was favored by the members.

The Commission's approval was reported to the Department of the Army.
EXHIBIT G

Revisions to the Chapel included simplifying the structural system and limiting the fascia to approximately six feet in depth, a considerably thinner mass than the original submission.

The members commented on the chapel section where clear glass provided light for the interior trees but where stained glass was used to produce a more subdued lighting over the seating area thus differentiating it. They considered the scheme improved but felt the lighting remained a problem. Several proposals were made to allow some contrast in the two spaces but at the same time diminish the apparent brightness of the exterior walls. These were discussed later with the architect. Final action was withheld until that time.

4. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Gallaudet College Dormitory Building - Revised Design by John S. Samperton and Associates, architects. Models and elevation drawings of the dormitory and the master plan for the campus were submitted, along with photos of the area.

A revised preliminary design of the proposed dormitory indicated a high-rise, brick and glass structure. The scheme, if approved, would establish the character of other dormitories on the campus.

The master plan included a high-school structure built into an existing hillside, new field house, classroom facility, and other future construction. Apparently, old and new plans were well interrelated.

Lacking plans and elevations of the building, the members deferred comment on the design which appeared from the model to be overly complicated.

A conference with the architect was held later.

b. Approval of Artist for Chandler, Oklahoma, Post Office

A print of the Post Office lobby showing the location of the proposed mural and a preliminary sketch of it were submitted with a brochure containing photographs of works by Betty J. Cox who was endorsed by civic groups and the Postmaster of Chandler.

The members considered the preliminary sketch naive in conception and totally devoid of artistic value.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to General Services Administration.

5. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Proposed Construction Program, FY 1969

Included in the Program were the development of the Mall Plan by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill and major repairs of the Jefferson Memorial to overcome the severe structural damage to the foundation due to settling.

The Commission approved the Program and informed the Department of the Interior. EXHIBIT H

6. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

Appendix 1

There was no objection to recommendations by the staff on the Shipstead-Luce applications listed on Appendix 1. EXHIBIT I

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) O.G. 68-113, 2901 M Street, N.W. - 1 story commercial building with= roof parking.

The Commission agreed with the Board of Architectural Consultants' decision to disapprove the design. The members considered it unsuitable to the corner location, a terminus of the Pennsylvania Avenue axis. This relationship and the character and scale of typical buildings on M Street should be reflected in the design.

The Commission's disapproval was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

(2) Appendix 2

There was no objection to the actions taken on the Old Georgetown Applications listed on Appendix 2. EXHIBIT J

7. D. C. Redevelopment Land Agency

Washington Channel Waterfront plan prepared by Sasaki, Dawson

DeMay Associates, landscape architects.

The plan was essentially that which had been approved some years ago by the Commission; a commercial area for low buildings bordering the waterfront along Maine Avenue - punctuated by a series of public parks or plazas. Publicly financed parking would be provided beneath the privately owned commercial facilities as well as on grade between Maine Avenue and Water Street. Public financing of the parking represents the chief difference in the present scheme. The Commission's special interest centered on some of the revised details such as setback dimensions of private construction, bulkhead elevations, circulation and the handling of the parking, especially between Water Street and Maine Avenue.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect later.

V. INTERVIEWS

1. D. C. Redevelopment Land Agency

Washington Channel Waterfront

Attending the meeting were Stanley Sherman and Joseph Canny of RLA, and Philip Minervino, representing the architect. Mr. Sasaki withdrew from the room.

In answer to the members' questions concerning the garage, Mr. Minervino stated that space was provided for 1500 cars. Until buildings are constructed on the garage roofs, plazas were planned. He commented that the garage feature was only a concept while the design for the parks was presented for approval.

The Commission approved the plans for the parks and other items previously mentioned, but requested detailed studies of the temporary plazas.

The Commission's action was forwarded to the Redevelopment Land Agency. EXHIBIT K

2. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

General Graham of the Transit Authority, Harry Weese, architect, and Massimo Vignelli, graphic designer, attended the meeting.

a. Stations at Connecticut Avenue and K Streets, N.W. and Union Station

Mr. Bunshaft expressed the Commission's approval of the design for the stations.

b. Graphics

Mr. Bunshaft led the discussion stating that the lettering should be "clear, strong, simple and beautiful." He commented that the curve of the tunnel and the rectangular pylons were not compatible. Continuing, he thought that possibly a single marker inside the station and several within the car were the only identifications necessary. The pylons within the stations marred the subway design.

General Graham informed the Commission that the pylons served also as air-conditioning ducts and part of the lighting system.

Mr. Sasaki remarked that the idioms of the subway design were consistent and those of the graphics, consistent also, but the two idioms were not related.

Mr. Vignelli replied that the square shape of the pylons reflected the coffered ceiling. Justifying the use of vertical lettering, he explained that perception was greater.

Summarizing the Commission's views Mr. Bunshaft stated that the design for graphics had become too prominent and tended to destroy the "basic, simple, strong space" of the subway design. The important feature of the entire plan was the subway design and the graphics should be subordinated to it.

The Commission felt more study should be given to the graphics.

The transcripts were forwarded to the Transit Authority and are made a part of the record. EXHIBIT L

The Commission's approval of the subway design and decision to take no action on the graphics were reported to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Arlington National Cemetery, Revised Design of Administration and Chapel

Attending the meeting were George E. Weber and W. H. Tamm of the Corps of Engineers, and F. D. Lethbridge, architect.

The Chairman stated the Commission's approval of the Administration Building.

Mr. Lethbridge explained the changes in the design of the chapel although the concept remained as originally presented. He commented that further study of the entrance and balcony was necessary.

Expressing the Commission's praise of the plan, Mr. Bunshaft suggested that the wall behind the altar not rise to the girders which would make it possible to sense the trees. He also suggested two approaches to the problem of lighting - eliminate the lighting in the center or retain it and eliminate lighting over the trees. Lighting of both areas appeared to weaken the definition of space.

Mr. Lethbridge replied that peripheral lighting was essential and that the coffered ceiling would have the source of controlled artificial lighting within it. He acknowledged the need for continued study of this feature.

The Commission's approval of the concept of the design for the chapel and suggestions were forwarded to the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers.

4. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Gallaudet College Dormitory Building - Proposed Design

Attending the meeting were L. L. Hunter and Russell Clarvoe, Public Buildings Service, and John S. Samperton, architect.

Speaking for the Commission, Mrs. Smith requested an explanation of the somewhat complicated plan. She commented that a simpler design might be more appropriate for the campus.

Mr. Samperton explained details of the plan in relation to its purpose saying that the rather unusual complexity of the plan reflected the special requirements of planning for deaf students and had been worked out with officials of Gallaudet only after the most careful study. The members were satisfied with his explanation.

Mr. Bunshaft suggested that the design of the upper story repeat the same general design treatment as at ground level, where the window bays terminated short of grade level. The plane of the walls at both levels would then be uninterrupted by windows. He thought this and substituting a parapet for the roof overhang would simplify the design.

The architect felt there would be no problem in incorporating the suggestion.

The Commission's approval was subject to revising the design as suggested.

The Commission's action was forwarded to General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service. EXHIBIT M

5. Department of the Navy

Defense Office Building, Bolling/Anacostia - Revised Design

Captain H. F. Curran and other representatives of the Department of the Navy, and Minoru Yamasaki, architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Yamasaki presented two new models depicting additional studies of the sunshade. He explained the development of the straight cantilever method which gave a simple, direct statement to the design and eliminated the hanger feature.

The Commission unanimously approved this plan. The Commission's approval was forwarded to the Department of the Navy. EXHIBIT N

6. Other Projects (Added)

a. Design of Medals

The Chairman proposed that the Commission explore methods of improving the quality of designs for medals produced by the Bureau of the Mint, Department of the Treasury. Stating that the Secretary of the Treasury would be consulted, he recommended that a separate advisory committee be established to review the design of medals. This method, adopted by the Post Office, had been successful in improving the design of stamps. The Commission's authority in designs of medals, would be advisory only at the request of the newly created board.

The members unanimously approved the Chairman's proposal.

b. Lighting on Bridges

The Chairman presented photographs of a bridge lighted from the balustrade. A brochure containing the engineering study of this system was circulated among the members. He proposed presenting this material to the National Park Service and also to the Highway Department as a method of re-lighting Memorial Bridge.

The members approved the Chairman's proposal.

7. Freer Gallery of Art

Inspection of Proposed Acquisitions

The Commission inspected works of art proposed for purchase by the Freer Gallery of Art.

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

7 February 1968

Dear Mr. Frey:

The Commission of Fine Arts favors draft legislation authorizing the Trustees of the National Gallery of Art to construct a building or buildings on the site bounded by Fourth Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, Third Street, and Madison Drive, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, and making provision for the maintenance thereof.

Formal approval was made at the Commission's meeting on January 17th.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. James H. Frey
Bureau of the Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503

EXHIBIT A

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 13778

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 31, 1967

Mr. HARSHA (for himself and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to preserve the integrity of the original agreements and amendments in the area.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act is amended (1) by adding "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 3.", and (2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(b) All agreements entered into by the District of Columbia government, and the decisions of the National Capital Planning Commission, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Zoning Commission of the Dis-

I

EXHIBIT B

trict of Columbia, made prior to the adoption of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1967 shall be honored and shall not be abrogated by the new District of Columbia government without the full knowledge and freely given consent of all the parties thereto.

"(c) Any violation of subsection (b) of this section shall be punished and may be enjoined in the same manner as a violation of the Act of June 1, 1910 (D.C. Code, secs. 5–401—5–409).

"(d) The John F. Kennedy Center Act is further amended by striking section 5 (c)."

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2518

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER 10, 1967

Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. PERCY) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to prohibit the erection of any building within one thousand feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in the District of Columbia without the approval of the Center's trustees, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act is amended (1) by adding "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 3.", and (2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(b) No building—

"(1) may be erected within one thousand feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts,

EXHIBIT C

"(2) may be erected within an additional five hundred feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts if the height of such building will exceed sixty feet, or

"(3) located within one thousand five hundred feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts may be altered or raised in any manner so as to exceed the height of sixty feet, unless the erection, alteration, or raising has been approved by the Board.

"(c) Any violation of subsection (b) of this section shall be punished and may be enjoined in the same manner as a violation of the Act of June 1, 1910 (D.C. Code, sec. 5-401—5-409).

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior may acquire within one thousand five hundred feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts lands or interest in lands including but not limited to scenic easements to be admitted as part of the park system of the District of Columbia."

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 13412

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 10, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to prohibit the erection of any building within one thousand feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in the District of Columbia without the approval of the Center's trustees, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act is amended (1) by adding "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 3.", and (2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(b) No building—

"(1) may be erected within one thousand feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts,

EXHIBIT D

"(2) may be erected within an additional five hundred feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts if the height of such building will exceed sixty feet, or

"(3) located within one thousand five hundred feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts may be altered or raised in any manner so as to exceed the height of sixty feet, unless the erection, alteration, or raising has been approved by the Board.

"(c) Any violation of subsection (b) of this section shall be punished and may be enjoined in the same manner as a violation of the Act of June 1, 1910 (D.C. Code, sec. 5–401—5–409).

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior may acquire within one thousand five hundred feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts lands or interest in lands including but not limited to scenic easements to be admitted as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia.".

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 914

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 30, 1967

Mr. SCHEUER introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas.

Whereas the immediate vicinity of the National Capitol Building is the seat of the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government; and

Whereas Washington, District of Columbia, was originally carefully planned as an attractive city with facilities which for many years thereafter were adequate for the efficient functioning of the said branches of Government and of personnel associated therewith and interested therein and for the related movements of residents of and visitors to the Nation's Capital; and

Whereas as the city has grown in population, various supple-

EXHIBIT E

mental plans have been developed from time to time for the city as a whole and for individual portions thereof; and

Whereas the present population of the city far exceeds that of any time in the past and will undoubtedly continue to expand; and

Whereas the functions of the legislative and judicial branches of Government and the number of persons associated therewith have likewise expanded greatly beyond the concepts of the initial planning process; and

Whereas the number of citizens who annually visit the Nation's Capitol has increased to approximately seven million and is anticipated to continue to increase in future years; and

Whereas it is in the national interest that the United States Capitol Grounds and the contiguous related and influencing areas be developed and maintained so as to facilitate functions of the legislative and judicial branches of Government, the access and egress of persons associated therewith, the existence at all times of an esthetic setting therefor appropriate to the seat of the legislative and judicial branches of Government, of which all Americans can justly be proud, and which interested citizens will desire to visit and will find pleasure in doing so; and

Whereas the environs of the Capitol include the Capitol Building and many houses and other buildings of historical and esthetic importance whose preservation will contribute to the beauty and distinction of the Capital City and the Capitol Grounds; and

Whereas, in order that such grounds and areas be so developed and maintained it is necessary that a long-range comprehensive plan be formulated, adopted, continually adminis-

tered and periodically updated to reflect future and presently unpredictable growth and changes in environment and circumstances: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the National Capital Planning Commission, shall enter into a contract on behalf of the United States with a nationally known consultant firm or group of such firms to conduct a full and complete study and analysis of the present and anticipated future development of the United States Capitol Grounds (as described in the first section of the Act of July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193a)), and the contiguous and related influencing areas, and, on the basis of such study and analysis, prepare a comprehensive and detailed plan for the suitable development (over the next twenty years) of such Grounds and areas. The consultant firm or group of such firms selected shall be properly qualified in all phases of the formulation of a comprehensive plan, including experience in (1) analysis of such factors as growth trends, socioeconomic impacts, traffic flow and terminal facilities, costs and economic feasibility, civic center and parklike developments, esthetic considerations, and controls imposed by subsurface conditions, (2) design, operation and maintenance of public facilities, (3) collection, codification, and use of data related to planning procedures previously prescribed by the Congress

for urban areas, (4) the preparation of factual and illustrated descriptive prospectuses and reports, and (5) similar functions essential to the formulation of an adequate and realistic comprehensive plan. In preparing such comprehensive plan, due consideration shall be given to the population growth of the Washington metropolitan area, the growth in the size of the staffs which work in the buildings on such Grounds and areas and their needs for access and egress, the facilities required for the convenience of visitors to such Grounds and areas and the buildings thereon, the occupancy and use of, and the services provided in, such facilities, considerations of accessibility to and intercommunication between buildings and grounds, open green areas, priorities, relocations resulting from developments, and the items essential to the formulation of an adequate and realistic comprehensive plan which were mentioned in the preceding sentence. During the course of its work, the consultant firm or group of such firms shall maintain close liaison with the Architect of the Capitol, the appropriate committees of the Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and other local agencies associated with the planning process. A preliminary draft of the report to contain the findings and recommendations of the consultant firm or group of such firms shall be submitted in sixty copies not later than nine months after the firm or group of such firms

has been notified to proceed with the work of the review and comment of the Architect of the Capitol, the appropriate committees of the Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and other local agencies associated with the planning process, and within six months after the consultant firm has been provided with such comments, it shall provide to the Architect of the Capitol one thousand copies of a printed report, properly illustrated in color, defining the recommended comprehensive plan, outlining the actions required for its implementation, and containing a schedule of appropriations estimated to be required therefor.

SEC. 2. The contract referred to in the first section shall not be entered into until after the approval of the terms and conditions thereof by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, nor shall the plan referred to in the first section become the approved comprehensive plan until appropriate action has been taken by such committees.

SEC. 3. Inasmuch as a projected comprehensive plan must be modified from time to time to give proper recognition to future developments as they occur and which cannot necessarily be fully anticipated, the Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the National Capital Planning Commis-

sion, shall enter into a contract for the review of the approved comprehensive plan at intervals not greater than five years and to submit the results of such review to the committees and other agencies mentioned in section 2 for appropriate consideration. Such periodic reviews should be made under contract with the same consultant firm or group of such firms which prepared the original comprehensive plan unless circumstances indicate otherwise.

SEC. 4. (a) Since the successful implementation of the plan developed under the first section of this Act requires that the buildings of the United States on the United States Capitol Grounds and on contiguous and related influencing areas be of the highest quality of design and construction, there is established an Architect Selection Committee (hereafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "committee") which shall select the architects for the construction, alteration, or repair of such buildings.

(b) The committee shall be composed of the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Architect of the Capitol, and Chairman of the Commission on Planning Architecture, and the chairman of each of the following: (1) The Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives; (2) the Committee on Public Works of the Senate; (3) the House Office Building Commission; (4) the Senate Office Building Commission; (5) the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

(c) Prior to the selection of an architect for the construction, alteration, or repair of any building for the United States on the United States Capitol Grounds or on contiguous and related influencing areas, the committee shall invite licensed arhcitects to submit their qualifications for the project, and the committee shall request the Commission on Architecture and Planning (established under section 5 of this joint resolution) to submit a list of qualified architects for the committee's consideration.

SEC. 5. Since the building and other construction projects undertaken by the United States on the United States Capitol Grounds should meet a standard which exemplifies and reflects excellence in architecture and land use and good taste and judgment and which demonstrates a proper regard for the historic and symbolic importance of the Capitol Building, there is established a commission to be known as the Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol (hereafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 6. (a) No design, planning, construction, alteration, or repair of any public building, or landscape development, on real property comprising the United States Capitol Grounds or on contiguous and related influencing areas may be undertaken by the United States without the advice of the Commission. The Commission shall by regulation prescribe

the procedure for submission of master plans for the area, designs or plans for construction, alteration, or repair, plans for landscape development, and may make such other regulations concerning submission of such plans as may be necessary for the Commission to carry out its functions under this joint resolution.

(b) Upon the request of the committee, the Commission shall submit for the committee's consideration a list of qualified architects for construction, alteration, or repair of buildings of the United States on the United States Capitol Grounds or on contiguous and related influencing areas.

(c) The Commission shall, upon request, advise any officer, agency, instrumentality, or department of the executive or legislative branch of the Federal Government with respect to any plans for such design, construction, alteration, or repair and with respect to any comprehensive plans for use by the United States on such Grounds or areas.

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall be composed of nine members as follows:

(1) The Architect of the Capitol.

(2) Three appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives from at least twelve architects nominated by the American Institute of Architects.

(3) One appointed by the President pro tempore of

the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives from at least four landscape architects nominated by the American Society of Landscape Architects.

(4) One appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives from at least four historian-preservationists nominated by the National Trust for Historic Preservation

(5) One appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives from at least four artists nominated by the National Council on the Arts and Humanities.

(6) One appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives from at least four sculptors nominated by the Commission of Fine Arts.

(7) One appointed by the President from among individuals in private life who are significantly interested or experienced in the matters to be considered by the Commission.

(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), each appointed member of the Commission shall serve for a term of three years from the expiration date of his predecessor's term.

(2) (A) Of the three architects first appointed under paragraph (2) of subsection (a), one shall be appointed for

a term of one year, one shall be appointed for a term of two years, and one shall be appointed for a term of three years, as designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives at the time of appointment.

(B) Of the members first appointed under paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) of subsection (a), one shall be appointed for a term of one year, two shall be appointed for a term of two years, and one shall be appointed for a term of three years, as designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The member first appointed under paragraph (7) of subsection (a) shall serve for a term of three years.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment (and for the balance of the unexpired term).

(d) The Commission shall elect a Chairman from among its members.

(e) No person may serve as a member of the Commission if such person, or an organization in which such person has a financial interest or is an officer, employee, partner, or associate, has any financial interest in a project of the United States which involves the design, planning, construction, alteration, or repair of any public building, or landscape development, on real property comprising the United States

Capitol Grounds or on contiguous and related influencing areas.

SEC. 8. Appointed members of the Commission shall each be entitled to receive $75 for each day (including traveltime) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of functions vested in the Commission.

(a) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, each member of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as the expenses authorized by section 5703 (b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(b) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman or a majority of its members.

SEC. 9. (a) The Commission shall appoint and fix the compensation of a Director subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(b) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as it deems advisable subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, gov-

erning appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 914

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas.

By Mr. SCHEUER

OCTOBER 30, 1967

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

7 February 1968

Dear General Graham:

This is merely to confirm the Commission of Fine Arts' approval on January 17th of the station designs at Connecticut Avenue and K Street, N.W. and Union Station.

As to the matter of graphics, you have the transcript of the Commission's comments which, of course, confirms that no formal disapproval of the design was made.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Major General Jackson Graham
General Manager
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
1634 Eye St., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT F

7 February 1968

Dear Mr. Robin:

This is merely to confirm the Commission of Fine Arts' approval on January 17th of the revised design for the Administration Building and Chapel at Arlington National Cemetery.

In both buildings, the Commission felt, the design was considerably improved. Because of the importance of the Chapel, we would like to follow up development of details and also inspect samples of the exterior materials.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. C. J. Robin
Chief, Engineering Division
Norfolk District, Corps of Engineers
Fort Norfolk, 803 Front Street
Norfolk, Virginia 23510

EXHIBIT G

7 February 1968

Dear Mr. Hartzog:

This will confirm the Commission of Fine Arts' approval at its meeting on January 17th of the proposed construction program for Washington parks in Fiscal Year 1969.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr.
Director
National Park Service
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT H

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS 1/17/68

NO SL 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
30	800 Market Space, NW Penn-Market Properties	Planting boxes & screening trees to conceal open park. lot.
ACTION:	App'd., 12/22/67.	

EXHIBIT I

APPENDIX 1

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

DEC 2 8 1967

NO SL 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
21	2500 Calvert St., NW Shoreham Hotel Corp.	Cut openings in exterior walls for installation of self-contained heat. & cool. units. Approx. 300 units.
ACTION:	App'd., provided air-cond. grills painted to match brickwork, 11/20/67.	
23	3129 Adams Mill Rd., NW Ronald P. Smith	Replace wood stair (steps) with metal steps, with w. i. railing similar to exist. w. i. railing.
ACTION:	App'd., 12/5/67.	
24	4155 Linnean Ave., NW Marjorie M. Post	Plant & tool storage bldg.
ACTION:	App'd., 11/29/67.	
25	1350 E St., NW D. C. Gov't. Dist. Bldg.	Replacement of doors at 13½ & 14th St., NW
ACTION:	App'd. as revised on drawings dtd. 12/1/67, 12/14/67.	
26	2425 Va. Ave., NW McLachlen National Bank	2 s-f illuminated alum. signs with plastic ltrs. 50 sq-ft total.
ACTION:	Disap'd. Suggest either reworking exist. sign or following recommendations in SL 66-75, DEC 2 8 1967	
27	3129 Adams Mill Rd., NW Ron Smith	Install alum. siding & shutters on front of house only.
ACTION:	Disap'd. Recom. repair & retention of exist. brick, DEC 2 8 1967	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued) DEC 2 8 1967

NO SL 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
28	627 Penna. Ave., NW Mark Weiss	Proposed Camera Center. Remove fire escape & brick up.

ACTION: Disap'd. Proposed renovations unsuitable. Suggest alterations more in character with original bldg., keeping such elements as cornice & balcony, DEC 2 8 1967

29	25 Louisiana Ave., NW Internat'l. Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers	Security lighting on D St. side, completely around bldg. incl. back & alleyside. Illumination of bldg. from planning area.

ACTION: App'd., provided that fixtures which illuminate upper portion of bldg. have adjustable intensity. This is to insure harmony of lighting on exterior, 12/19/67.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS 1/17/68

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
111	1050 Wisc. Ave., NW The Uncommon Market	Provide new entr. & new steel stairs w/wood handrail & wood deck.
ACTION: Ret'd. at the request of the applicant, 1/12/68.		
125	2909 Olive St., NW Jan Di Marco Studios	Install rear wood deck with iron hand rail; used brick ret. wall; install two 15-light French doors; install sliding door at basem. rear level; repair crack in front of bldg.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided scrollwork is eliminated from ironwork. No further subm. requested, 1/11/68.		
126	3000 M St., NW Sinclair Refining Co.	Service station attendant's house.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided roof top spikes are eliminated, 1/11/68.		
127	3288 M St., NW Vesuvio Ristorante	Awning above doorway.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided awning is solid color of either dark blue, green, tan, or olive, 1/4/68.		
Inf. 128	1258 Wisc. Ave., NW W.R. & A.G. Bishop	Alterations to facade.
ACTION: Recom. restudy of relationship between upper & lower cornice trim. Suggest study of old photos. of this bldg. at Peabody Rm. in D. C. Pub. Library, Georgetown Br. or Libr. of Congress, Div. of Prints & Photos., or Columbia Historical Society, 1/11/68.		
129	3034 Cambridge Pl., NW Suzanne Walsh	Install 2 iron balconies & 1 stairway from 1st fl. to garden. Install 2 doors in place of windows. Install 6" metal asbestos flue from basem. to roof.
ACTION: Request revised drawings eliminating scrollwork & diminishing steepness of stair, 1/11/68.		

EXHIBIT J

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
131	1401-31st St., NW Elgin A. McKenna	Install 6' stockade fence.
ACTION:	No obj., 1/11/68.	
132	3320 M St., NW American Sec. & Trust Co.	Remove exist. showwindow & replace with window & knee wall.
ACTION:	Restudy & resubm. Lower sill & subdivide showwindow with muntins, 1/11/68.	
Inf. 133	1365 Wisc. Ave., NW John W. Molyneaux (commercial)	Renovation of bldg., exterior & interior.
ACTION:	No obj., but a symmetrical entr. & doorway would be preferable, 1/11/68.	
134	1637 Wisc. Ave., NW Mr. Roberts Beauty Shop	1 s-f, 8 sq-ft sign.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Character & materials unsuitable. Suggest simple, classical, upper-case ltrs., black ltrs. painted directly on wood fascia, 1/17/68.	
135	1637 Wisc. Ave., NW Mr. Roberts Beauty Shop	1 s-f, 2-1/3 sq-ft sign.
ACTION:	Not recom'd., proposed location unsuitable for any sign, 1/17/68.	
Inf. 113	2901 M St., NW Theodore & Jas. Pedas	1-story commercial bldg. with roof parking. Food store on 1st fl. level. Theatre below grade.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Bldg. type & design unsuitable to location on corner of M & 28th St. & on axis with Pa. Ave. Recognition of this relationship plus recognition of character & scale of typical bldgs. on M St. essential to design of any new bldg. on this site, 1/17/68.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

DEC 2 8 1967

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
109	2706 Olive St., NW Mrs. E. Echeverria	Additions & repairs.

ACTION: Recom. restudy of rear elevation. Character unsuitable for this visible location, 12/21/67.

110	2707 N St., NW Fritch Bishop	Cover exist. wood siding with 8" aluminum siding.

ACTION: Ret'd. for material sample & photos showing house in relation to street. Indicate exact surfaces to be covered, 12/8/67.

112	1719-21 Wisc. Ave., NW David Cooper	Awning sample.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided bldg. is painted grey, 12/21/67.

114	3288 M St., NW Vesuvio Ristorante	1 canvas awning suspended from bldg. above doorway with fixed iron frames.

ACTION: Resubm. See OG 68-85 & OG 68-75. Drawings must show exact dimension from awning to window frames. Show exact location from bottom of cornice, 12/21/67.

115	2515 P St., NW Froe Properties	Proposed apt. bldg. Section thru fan & parapet. Brick panel sample, United Clay "Georgetown Colonial C-70."

ACTION: Recom'd. for sample as subm'd. of United Clay-Georgetown Colonial, C-70, & buff mortar as shown on sample. Erect sample panel on site for final approval. No mechanical equipm. to project above parapet, 12/21/67.

116	1679-32nd St., NW Wm. Neel	Constr. areaway & front door in basem. front wall. All below grade.

ACTION: No obj., 12/19/67.

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
117	3000 M St., NW Sinclair Refining Co.	Service Station attendant house.
ACTION: Restudy & resubm. Character of openings unsuitable, 12/21/67.		
118	3061 M St., NW Shima Co.	1 19-sq-ft, non-illuminated plastic ltr. sign.
ACTION: Recom. smaller or more delicate ltrs., 12/21/67.		
119	1401-31st St., NW Elgin A. McKenna	6' stockade fence.
ACTION: Recom. restudy with fence set back to main house bldg. line, 12/21/67.		
120	1352-28th St., NW Edward Burling	Remodeling & addn. to dwelling.
ACTION: Recom. restudy. Old entr. seems oversimplified, 12/21/67.		
121	1545 Wisc. Ave., NW Humble Oil & Refining Co.	Replace exist. exterior service station lighting with new lighting on pump islands & new yard flood-lighting.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Proposed fixtures are totally out of character with both station bldg. & Old Georgetown location, DEC 2 8 1967		
122	3211 R St., NW J. V. Mladek	Addn. to rear of house, living, on 1st fl., bedrm. 2nd fl., studio under roof. In brick.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest addn. which will preserve the arch'l. geometry of the exist. house, DEC 2 8 1967		

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
123	2707 N St., NW Fritch Bishop	Cover right side only (i.e. as one faces house, the right side of house to be covered) with 8" white alum. siding. Corner post adapted to one side.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided remainder of bldg. is painted to match alum. siding, & wooden corner board trim only is used, 12/21/67.

124	3110 M St., NW Pottery Fair	Replace plate glass windows with egg-crate type windows. Also signs.

ACTION: Recom. resubm. with better drawings showing every surface & exact number & size of lights in each. Recom. a slightly thinner muntin section. Subm. more accurate drawing of sign showing exact style of ltrs. Use only upper case vertical classical ltrs., 12/21/67.

7 February 1968

Dear Mr. Appleby:

This is merely to confirm the Commission of Fine Arts' approval on January 17th of the revised designs for the Washington Channel Waterfront.

This approval covers the basic site plan, bulkhead elevations, circulation and landscaping.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. L. Thomas Appleby
Executive Director
D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
1420 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

EXHIBIT K

thing is immaterial, but you do not build buildings on top of buildings -- where does the plumbing and all that go?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It isn't.

We do want to move along. I think we should approve it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What I am talking about has nothing to do with it. The only thing we ought to say is the island ought to be landscaped.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is right, and put to use.

All right. We are agreed.

OPEN SESSION

V. 2. Washington Metropolitan Area
Transit Commission - Subway System

a. Stations at Connecticut Ave. & K Sts., N.W., and Union Station

b. Graphics

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Gentlemen, welcome to the Subway!

What are the specific things up for action on this today?

MR. ATHERTON: Two stations, one at Union Station, one at Connecticut and K; and the Graphics.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Those are the two issues.

Mr. Weese, good morning. Do you have any words that you want to add, Harry? Do you have anything you wish to say to us?

EXHIBIT L

EXHIBIT

MR. WEESE: I will respond to any questins. I don't think it is too different from before. The real issue today, I would think, would be the graphics.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are ready on that.

Do you have any questions you want to ask?

MRS. SMITH: No, I think the model is just great.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well then, let's just plunge right into the graphics.

Unless all your customers are going to be laying down, we think they will not be able to know what station they are passing through, with the lettering going sideways.

Have you ever ridden a subway -- I am beginning to wonder.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Only in Russia, where he couldn't read!

MR. WEESE: We would like to have you clear your minds of any prejudices that you might have formed.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Prejudices -- our prejudices are based on riding subways.

MR. WEESE: And we would like to have you hear from Mr. Vignelli. I think you know who he is. He did the Milan system and has done studies for New York in depth, and it is a three-year-old outfit, which Massimo and Ralph Erickson put together; and, further, among their clients is American Airlines, Ford --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We don't want their clients.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes. Sit down.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft wishes to say something.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we are all flabbergasted and pleased with the model. When you look at that model, forgetting the lettering for the moment, I think the vertical things do not go with that design. I think the forms have to be something besides posts. Now, that is forgetting the lettering to begin with.

I think they don't relate, they are too high, and a few other things, plus the fact that we don't have to be clever here. All we want is this lettering to be clear, strong, simple, beautiful.

It seems to us, -- I think I can say us?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are united on this.

MR. BUNSHAFT: -- that the forms ought to be compatible. And I think if we accept that, and the issue of horizontal-vertical lettering becomes unimportant. Vertical letters, I don't think this group is going to buy. I don't care if he has done all of Europe.

Now, if you would like to take it from there.

MR. WEESE: Yes, I would.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Otherwise, we are on your side for a while.

MR. WEESE: I am on your side as long as I think you are right; but let me give a little background on this.

The trouble with this review process, if I may say so, both its strength and weakness is that you can come to conclusions before you have heard --

MR. BUNSHAFT: I just want to express our concern, so when you speak you understand our position.

MR. WEESE: The question of the identification and the identity of the whole system and the name of it is all intertwined, and when you come -- Massimo will start out with the symbol itself, which stands on the surface, which is related to the dignity that is necessary for this Capital City.

He will speak about lollipops, Esso signs, and so on. And he will speak about other ways of calling the name, about symbols and trademarks.

When we first saw this and this was unfolded to us gradually, we first addressed ourselves to the problem of what happens to the surface, the marker, the identity of the whole system, and it was only after a long process, I must say about six months of step-by-step, that we finally found ourselves at the last issue, which is the identification of each station. And there is more than meets the eye, so I would like Massimo to be able to start out with a fairly objective --

of decline --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are perfectly willing. As you well know, we don't have time for a philosophic lecture. I am serious.

MR. WEESE: How much time does he have?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have got a whole collection of clients out there. I am afraid we don't have time to go into his total reasoning on the thing.

MR. WEESE: How much time do you think he should spend?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: He should spend none, really.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think he ought to explain it without too much history; isn't that what you are saying? Maybe you would like the model over here.

MR. VIGNELLI: Well, to make it very, very short, I think the explanation is that we know that, from studies that we had before, that horizontal panel-on-the-track kind of lettering is much more difficult to perceive than something which comes in the same direction in which the driver is coming to the station.

It is more difficult to read in that respect [indicating], and of course it is easy to read when it is right here [indicating]. These poles, they are angled in 45 degrees to the station, so when you enter the station, if you come that way [indicating], you see a sequence of these poles, which are right in front of you, so when you

stop, you see even better.

Besides that, is the fact that it is vertical lettering, which could go up and down, it doesn't matter, and the vertical lettering, for instance, is again stopping your perception or increasing your perception rather than the parallel-to-the-track kind of lettering, because of its unusualness.

In fact, it is more of a shock, so you read it; otherwise, it would tend to be sort of an absorption.

The other point is that most of the time really the name of the station is not that important -- it is important, but it is not so much important as most people think, immediately, because it requires most of the riders in the train, a view of a symbol, the very quick perception of the length of the word, which is important because people -- well, most of the time ride on the subway from one station to the other, every morning, and those are the great majority of riders. Of course maybe there is 20 percent of the others, tourists, people which might travel for the first time to one station or the other; but this kind of information is not illegible for those riders.

So there is no need to talk about type, you know what has been chosen in comparison to other type faces, you know why bronze has been used as the material.

On the outside especially we think anything like a

pole which Harry was mentioning just now, the lollipop approach, would be too much commercial, too much indignity, too much unrelated.

The M, which stands for the name, has the initial of the name of the system, which relates to the fact of Metropolitan Area, and is the official name for this media of transportation, this kind of transportation, are always called Metro, Metropolitan.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They are not always called Metros in America, where we are building it!

MR. VIGNELLI: But Metro is the only kind of transportation --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I am not objecting to it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: In this country, "subway" is the word.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Subway happens to be the American word.

MR. VIGNELLI: Subway is the New York word, most of all.

MR. WALKER: Underground is --

MR. VIGNELLI: Is the London name, as a matter of fact.

The cities from Montreal to Moscow, and other cities, they call them Metro. And it is the international name for this kind of system.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I wonder if we couldn't just talk about some things. When you come into a station, you are on foot, and there is a marker outside the subway station, and we will leave that for a minute, and when you are in the station, say you forget where you are. What you have here is the problem of trying to have a sign, when everything is going that way, and you are trying to have a sign in the way that really is hard to do. Why should there be any signs along the long wall? Why should the identification for people getting off the subway be extremely well done by lighting up and what-not in the car? I think this thought of trying to read a sign like this, or horizontal,from a crowded car, is probably wrong to begin with.

If you ended up by not having any, except at the upper levels, inside on each side, to identify the station as you came into it, if you didn't have but the one out in the street and had none in here except one in the train --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That flashed on.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Say people are standing at each end -- well, I think it is impossible to design, the problem of having something in the station that you could read; so maybe the approach is not in the station, but the design of these things in the place where it should be.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: In the car.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The other thing is in the outside

one. I agree with you, it shouldn't be a --

MR. VIGNELLI: A lollipop.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But there isn't anything that says this can't be something six feet by six feet, with lettering horizontally on it. It can't be a real powerful -- it doesn't have to be a two-foot by two-foot.

MR. VIGNELLI: It should be seen from a certain distance.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I know, but if you make something big enough, that lettering can go up on it, like Judiciary Square, which is two words, but horizontally on a massive thing, I think would be wonderful, bronze, marble.

Now, you could have your lettering horizontally on your end, really, you could have something if you have the room.

MR. WEESE: That is the problem.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, some places you would be able to do it. I don't think any sign is the right sign, when you really get down to it, of a car moving, coming in to a long place, people crowded in; I don't think you read this or the other one unless it gets to be very huge, like they are in Paris. They are really big. And the answer would be to have it in the car.

MR. VIGNELLI: They will be in the car as well; but you, when you get out of the car, need two kinds of

distance.

MR. SUMMERS: [illegible] on [illegible] Square, which is two [illegible] chair. I [illegible]

Now, you could have [illegible] or just-and, really, you [illegible] the room.

MR. [illegible]

[illegible] to do it. I don't [illegible] you really are [illegible] long place, [illegible] the other one unless it [illegible] in Reed. They [illegible] have it in the [illegible]

MR. [illegible] but you, [illegible]

information: one is train information, you are there, if the train is gone you are lost anyhow; but still you need another kind of information, which is directional.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't mean to design this, and I don't know how; but if there was some clear way of floating a sign as part of the sculpture, it is not easy, at each end, which you could read coming in, and people along here could read way above -- these don't help this wonderful design here [indicating on model].

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The posts look terrible in the model.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think it would be much nicer if it wasn't there at all.

MR. ROSZAK: I think you have got to have some identification in the station.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There is no question; but I like the idea of doing it in the car.

MR. ROSZAK: How does it work in detail?

MR. WALKER: Just like "no smoking" signs in an airplane.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It should be automatic. The next station is so-and-so --

MR. WALKER: The next station is.

MR. ROSZAK: When you get down to the details of designing it, you are up against a problem.

interaction was in train subconsciously, as the train of the train is open and lose anybody and until you access kind of information, which is convenient.

MR. DUNPHREY: I don't mean to mention this, but I don't know how it works was some interruption of [illegible] again as part of the sculpture, it is not easy to open [illegible] which you could read during it, and keep [illegible] read way above -- close [illegible] very wonderful feature there [indicating on model].

CHAIRMAN MASON: The gross load variable is the model.

MR. DUNPHREY: I think it would be used first if it wasn't there at all.

DR. ROSZAK: I think you have yet to have more identification in the station.

CHAIRMAN MASON: Since it was mentioned, I was the idea of doing it in the car.

DR. ROSZAK: How does it work [illegible]

DR. MANLEY: Does like 'no smoking' signs in airplane.

CHAIRMAN MASON: It should be automatic. One need station is no-smoking --

DR. [illegible]: The next station is.

DR. ROSZAK: When you get down to the matrix of deciding it, you are at realize a problem.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If you will turn the proceedings to the table, please --

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we could summarize, maybe, by suggesting that you take another look at where is the best place to solve, not assume that you have to have signs at all -- I just throw it out; maybe you have been through that area, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: As far as nomenclature goes, you have chosen the toughest station, Judiciary Square. Have we got a worse name?

MR. GRAHM: The typical names are two-worded names.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But Dupont is a terribly easy word, that your clients will recognize. But Judiciary is going to be a tough word to get across.

MR. GRAHM: I think we are agreed that people will be looking over people, and the first two or three letters -- may I say something off the record?

[Discussion off the record.]

MR. SASAKI: If you will also look at the side drawings and the architect drawings, it follows a consistent idiom, if you will, a method of expression.

And if you will look at the graphic designer, he follows consistency, but the two are not compatible. We are not saying this is bad design, but it just doesn't go together.

I think you can see it on the other model. Everything,

including your benches, including the rail track, and then suddenly there is this left hanging. This pole here, this rectangular pole looks structural and it is so high.

You know the designer's response immediately -- what structural reasons are there? There aren't any. This is really graphic, symbol, that really has nothing to do with the building itself [indicating].

So I think you selected a darn good graphic designer, but he hasn't got together with you as a darn good architect designer.

MR. VIGNELLI: We have approached this problem from several points of view in the course of the project. We started first with the horizontal kind of signs, which is paneled, everything attached to the structure. Nevertheless, we had this long thing.

Then we had the panel situation. And until this pole came about, and this was the thing which was fitting the best in the tunnel, in the sense that it was making a counterpoint between the tunnel and -- so it is sort of a milestone -- it is long sidewalk. And I think it is right, and we were very happy that the whole thing really got together.

I must say, really, that the big pusher behind this is Harry, which I am very glad in that respect, because it overcame the kind of weakness we might have. Because,

how can I say it, the job of the pole and the vertical reading, it was something a little bit difficult for us to digest in the beginning. We liked it, but were very much concerned ab out it for the last two or three months. It keeps growing, keeps getting better and better.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Sasaki.

MR. SASAKI: I would say anyone can make a good talk in justification of this design, because I think it is good design; I think in terms of all its proportions and so forth, it is good. But I think it still doesn't get around the fact that it doesn't fit in with the total environment with which it is supposed to fit.

Now, jump all over me, because it only solves one thing, but as an example, you use square poles, rectangular in form. I think this would fit very well in a great number of other buildings that we have seen, and certainly would fit in some of the buildings that Gordon himself has designed. I think it would really be superb.

But I think because the genesis of the form of the subway design, as a transportation, as you know the kind of structural solution to the forms, and the forms as they express the flow of traffic, I don't find this thing fitting at all.

Let's just say, for the sake of argument, if you took a round pole, you immediately impose value judgment on

how can I say it, the [illegible] [illegible]
seating, is not something I could [illegible] [illegible] is
dinner in the [illegible]. We [illegible] it, but were [illegible]
concerned about it for the [illegible] of [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

MR. SHELBY: I would [illegible] [illegible] I [illegible]
fair in [illegible] of this matter, because I [illegible]
good design; I think it [illegible] of all [illegible] [illegible]
form, is [illegible]. And I think it [illegible] [illegible]
the fact that it [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
with [illegible] is [illegible].

Now, [illegible] all [illegible], because [illegible]
ation, but as an example, you [illegible] [illegible],
an [illegible]. I think this would [illegible] [illegible]
of other [illegible] that we have [illegible], and [illegible]
[illegible] some of the [illegible] that [illegible]
I think it would [illegible] [illegible].

But I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible], as a [illegible], we [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] to be [illegible], and the [illegible]
[illegible] the [illegible] [illegible], I don't [illegible]
at all.

Let's [illegible], for the [illegible] [illegible]. If
took a [illegible], you [illegible] [illegible]

the lollipop; you say you don't like lollipops, it is undignified. What if I said I liked it, and it was dignified?

MR. VIGNELLI: I do love lollipops for lollipop purposes.

MR. SASAKI: No matter what you say , you are not dealing with the basic issue here.

I think it is a matter of form resolution between the two. Look at your bench detail, and look at your railing detail, and so forth. You can go the other way. You can make some of the smaller details of the furnishings and so forth more closer to here. I don't care if you want it back, or he comes to meet you; but somewhere you are standing across the railroad track there --

MR. VIGNELLI: I think this is a very good suggestion. And I think certainly it might sharpen the sensitiveness between the two of us, about the integration of the elements.

MR. SASAKI: You could use vertical to round, just in terms of harmony between the two forms, you know.

MRS. SMITH: Does it have to come full size down on the floor?

MR. WEESE: Yes. They are 15-inch-square ducts through which air is introduced and spilled on the platform, where it cools people. You can't cool the entire space. We have to direct it, localize it on the platform. We will

have to either do it or have a grille through the wall, and we have been trying to make everything float in the space. That is the name of the game.

And we thought this would be the most invisible air-conditioning system that anybody could devise. I am really disappointed that it didn't hit you like it hit us, and I was forecasting that you would like it.

So I go away completely 100 percent wrong.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Roszak.

MR. ROSZAK: You talk about a philosophic approach to all of this; but looking at this, I would like to ask you: How philosophically did you reconcile this kind of vertical leveling with the fact that human beings have been reading for millions of years on horizontal lines?

How do you eliminate this?

MR. VIGNELLI: I think it is true what you say, as well as true what I am saying, that human beings have been used to reading either horizontally or vertically, or on 45-degree angles. I think it would be right in the sense that I would say 99 percent of the time we do read horizontally. Still, there is one percent of the time when we read vertically, and I think we get the message, too.

MR. ROSZAK: But you are creating unnecessary conflicts and frustrations.

MR. VIGNELLI: As I was saying before, we believe

that this kind of vertical reading, opposite horizontal, tends to snap the -- saturates one's perception --

MR. ROSZAK: You mean this does?

MR. VIGNELLI: This is not an interruption [indicating].

MR. ROSZAK: If the horizontal lettering to which we have been accustomed for thousands of years doesn't work because it absorbs what you call our perception, I question this very much. How much more difficult it is to even get at the identification of the vertical lettering in this case; in other words, I think you are creating obstacles which may be interesting from a poetic point of view, but from a practical, everyday, ordinary John using the subway, he doesn't dwell on these conflicts. He wants to get in and get out as soon as possible, and make identifications as easily as possible.

MR. VIGNELLI: For instance, let's suppose for instance that we have a pole which performs many other functions, including the air-conditioning for instance, and we letter the horizontal type here, that would be really very small, you see.

MR. ROSZAK: You can't relate a horizontal piece of lettering to that kind of basic structure. You would have to redesign it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We have only seen your designs every couple of months or so, and you might say we have a fresh eye; and I think you have a great form, and I think our feeling is that it is wonderful, as it is. You have also the train coming in, which was the big metallic thing, and that is going to be nice as a metallic thing, in counter-balance to this great concrete structure. I think what we are saying, and all of us feel, is that the design motif for the graphics is becoming too prominent a design in the visual thing you see in this model. We don't think it ought to be that important a design.

Now, this is a tendency that happens when you hire a landscape guy, and it ends up a landscape where you can't find your building. If you hire your sculptor, if he has a free hand, you have got to look for the building. I think it is only natural, because every man does what he is skilled at.

I think the graphics here, as far as the air-conditioning goes, that is detail that could be put into a little thing, spreading out from those other walls and could be made quite sculpturally in the bottom of those closed walls. You could get it to flow up from a slot some way. I think air-conditioning can be separated from this.

I think when you have to have lighting in the middle, that ought to be solved in its own way. I think

MR. EDWARDS: We have only been here
every couple of months or so. And you know, not me
fresh eye. But I think you have -- have been, in a
our feeling is that we do Monopoly, or if we, you have
also the train coming in. What was the special thing,
and that is going to be nice as a [illegible] thing, in
counter-balance to this great-concern economic. I value
what we are saying, and all of us here, to this new
design model for the premium is becoming the predominant
a design in the wheel. What you see in this model. We
don't think it could be an item important a design.

Now, this is a condition that happens when you
give a landscape guy, and it ends up a landscape where you
can't find your building. If you drive your tractor, if
he has a free hand, you have not to look at the uniform.
I think it is most natural, because every man does what he
is called me.

I think the graphics here, we can see the ad-
condition down, that is detail that could be our lower
little thing, operating our tree house rather more and don't
be made quite secretarily in the bottom of those closed
walls. You could get it to flow on from a tiny area to
I think air-conditioning may be accepted from this.

I think when you come in some lighting in the
middle, that maybe we've answer in the own way. I think

what we are all saying is that this is too prominent a design, and it is destroying, in our opinion, the basic simple, strong space.

In order to get the lettering so it is visual, whether it is vertical or horizontal, get it up high enough, becomes too big a motif. When you walk in -- anybody -- and look at that model, these things seem to distract from the great thing you had.

I think the lettering has to be somehow solved, maybe subordinated from the basic thing. I don't think you can have everything equally important.

Isn't this essentially what we are saying?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think this is the summation.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think what we are saying is that we think you are spoiling your great structural thing by this lettering.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Not the lettering, but the posts.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If there is no lettering on it, whether it is horizontal or crosswise, we think the post is the error.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Horizontal is not the issue.

MR. WEESE: I didn't think you were that conservative.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You can do it upside-down, if you --

MR. BUNSHAFT: There are any number of places to

get a little group, or sculptural level coming out of the concrete; and I don't think that is the reason for this, I mean necessarily.

MR. GRAHM: It needs to be 10 or 12 feet high.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I know. Throwing the air, you can throw air from the floor over there to up here. If it is flowing out this way, it has to be 12 feet up, no question about it; but let's say that you have a grille that curved up --

MR. WEESE: Wouldn't that be as prominent as this?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Talking about a little structural thing. There are other ways. I don't want to design it. But I don't think, looking at that model, and we just looked at it for the first time, those things really destroy this whole thing.

That is our feeling.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are not approaching this in a superficial way. I have promised you we would discuss it this morning, and it isn't vertical versus horizontal in the lettering; we are talking about those shapes.

MR. WALKER: I want to back up what you are saying. I think you have a beautiful design, and these verticals do destroy it. I like Mr. Bunshaft's idea, I think it can be done within the train itself.

You still have a problem saying what station they

are in, but suppose in the floor you had lettering that would indicate that?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: People would be standing on it.

MR. WALKER: Well, anyway, all I am saying is, and I will stop, is that I agree with what Mr. Bunshaft is saying. Seeing this thing and being so thrilled by the design itself, I feel this does destroy it.

MR. WEESE: Vertical elements are like people --

MR. BUNSHAFT: That is the thing, Harry, they are not like people. Six feet is a nice proportion for this space. If this thing were six feet high, they wouldn't count.

MR. WEESE: Look at it, they are closer together than they are supposed to be.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The height of them is very unpleasant.

MR. WEESE: That gives us something to go on.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Maybe something at each end, maybe designed as a major piece of sculpture.

MR. WEESE: But you have also said, if these could be smaller and not intrude on the scene so much, that they might be more acceptable.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They remain basically air-conditioning ducts that are stuck out there; that is what we are objecting to.

MR. WEESE: Well, you didn't know they were air-conditioning ducts until I told you.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we are against vertical lettering, too.

MR. WEESE: I think that is a separate element.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Let's leave it out for the moment.

MR. WEESE: You have to look for your information. You are free unless you want it, instead of having it shouted at you all the time. I think what you are saying is you don't need any and then you are saying they don't need it -- the other thing we have to mention is that this system of the pole or whatever you want to call it, is repeated in every-thing.

It is repeated in turnstiles, repeated in kiosks, and it is that kind of furniture thing -- maybe it is too high along the platform. If you could tell us it is too high and give us another chance to live again, that would be very encouraging. But if you say there is something wrong with vertical elements completely, then you would tell us that we cannot use one motif for identification through the system.

MR. SASAKI: I think, so as to simplify this, we are saying there is a conflict because this intrudes too greatly. We don't care whether you subdue it by harmony, height or what-not, then it would play a minor role --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Then it would be just air-conditioning.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It would be what it is.

MR. WEESE: It would also be information. You couldn't put those signs big enough in the ends of a 600-foot station -- you can't see that far.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I have another suggestion. We are all talking about what these people are going to do in the subway, and legibility and reading and all of that, and there isn't anybody here that -- the only way you would really find out, probably, is to open one up, test it. Maybe one idea would be to separate graphics from any structural things, so that if graphics are wrong, that can be changed.

MR. GRAHM: In fact, Massimo never had air-conditioning in mind when he came to these poles. We added that later.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We have to get at this height to read on a vertical element, over the level of the mass of people walking around, and that forces you into something, I suppose, I don't know what it is -- 12 feet, 14 feet --

MR. VIGNELLI: This is 11 feet.

MR. WEESE: It can be smaller.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Look at it in the model, Harry. We question whether you need any of this at all. It just spoils this great room.

MR. VIGNELLI: If there isnothing there, it might be very possible -- and this is what I think Harry's feeling

is -- it would be just an empty, long, gallery tunnel, you know, and it might lose something.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't think it would lose anything with this ceiling.

MR. GRAHM: It is little less than half.

Off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Back on the record.

MR. VIGNELLI: I think it would be interesting to see another section, to see the previous studies -- I apologize for insisting, but I think it might be useful to see them and the counter-effect.

MR. BUNSHAFT: There could be a counter-point, but it has to be a counter-point, not equal to the size of the music of the same piece.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If it is satisfactory to you, we are perfectly willing to take no action on the graphic side. We are approving the station design.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Come back with some roughs.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If it is suitable with you, we will take no action on the graphics; but we have discussed them in depth with you.

MR. GRAHM: The other approach is what we took earlier.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You don't have to solve this

immediately, anyway, do you?

MR. WEESE: I think there is probably some common ground we could find.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thanks very much.

[Messrs. Weese, Vignelli and Grahm withdrew from the room.]

V. 3. Department of the Army,
Corps of Engineers -
Arlington National Cemetery, Revised
Design of Administration Building and Chapel

MR. WEBER: I know you are running behind. This is a resubmittal of the Memorial Chapel and Administration Building, and Mr. Lethbridge has worked over the presentation from what was presented in November.

We hope he has been responsive to your comments.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good. Mr. Iethbridge.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: Mr. Chairman, may I take up the Administration Building first?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Let's do. We thought it was a great improvement and liked it a good deal. We are approving the Administration Building.

MR. WALKER: You have got the court with you!

MR. LETHBRIDGE: We modified the plan.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It seems to us very pleasant.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We think it fulfills its function

7 February 1968

Dear Mr. Schmidt:

This is merely to confirm the Commission of Fine Arts' approval on January 17th of the new master plan and the dormitory building at Gallaudet College.

The approval of the dormitory design was made on the condition that the roof structure be modified, eliminating the strong horizontal fascia and substituting instead a parapet wall sufficiently high to screen mechanical equipment on the roof. We also think it would be advisable to erect a substantial sample panel of brick on the site before beginning construction. There are already too many exterior materials on the campus and even though the architect is planning to use brick, its color and that of the mortar is critical.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. William A. Schmidt
Commissioner
Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C. 20405

EXHIBIT M

7 February 1968

Dear Captain Curren:

This is merely to confirm the Commission's approval on January 17th of the revised facades for the Defense Office Building at Bolling-Anacostia.

The action applies to the scheme which completely omitted the vertical hangers which, as you know, were the Commission's principal objection to the earlier designs.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Captain H. F. Curren
Commanding Officer
Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Building 57, Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20390

EXHIBIT N

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
17 January 1968

AM
10:00

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting:
   Executive Session: 20 February 1968
   Open Session: 21 February 1968

2. Approval of Minutes of November 1967 Meeting

III. LEGISLATION

1. Draft Legislation - Bureau of the Budget - 90thC

   Authorizing the Trustees of the National Gallery of Art to construct a building or buildings on the site bounded by Fourth Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, Third Street, and Madison Drive, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, and making provision for the maintenance thereof.

2. H.R. 13778-11/9/67-Mr. Harsha-90thC

   To amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to preserve the integrity of the original agreements and amendments in the area.

3. H.J.Res. 914-10/30/67-Mr.Scheuer-90thC

   To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive plan for the U.S.Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas.

IV. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. Department of the Navy

   Defense Office Building, Bolling/Anacostia-Revised Design

2. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission

   Washington Subway System:

   a. Stations at Connecticut Ave. & K St., N.W., and Union Station
   b. Graphics

3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

   Arlington National Cemetery, Revised Design of Administration Building and Chapel

4. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Gallaudet College Dormitory Building-Revised Design

b. Approval of Artist for Chandler, Oklahoma, Post Office

5. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Proposed Construction Program, FY 1969

6. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

Appendix 1

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) OG 68-113, 2901 M St., N.W.-1 story commercial building with roof parking

(2) Appendix 2

7. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

Washington Channel Waterfront

V. INTERVIEWS

10:45 1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

Washington Channel Waterfront

11:15 2. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission

Washington Subway System

a. Stations at Connecticut Ave. & K Sts., N.W. & Union Station
b. Graphics

11:45 3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Arlington National Cemetery, Revised Design of Administration Building and Chapel

12:00 4. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Gallaudet College Dormitory Building - Proposed Design

12:15 5. Department of the Navy

Defense Department Building, Bolling/Anacostia-Revised Design

1:00 6. Freer Gallery of Art